

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/753,840 01/08/2004 Joseph Armstrong Martin R0159B-REG 6037 EXAMINER 24372 08/18/2005 7590 ROCHE PALO ALTO LLC LEWIS, PATRICK T PATENT LAW DEPT. M/S A2-250 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 3431 HILLVIEW AVENUE PALO ALTO, CA 94304 1623

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Application No.		Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary			10/753,840		MARTIN, JOSEPH	ARMSTRONG
		E	Examiner		Art Unit	
			Patrick T. Lewis	L	1623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) 🗌 F	Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
2a) 🔲 🧵	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
-	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
5)□ (6)⊠ (7)□ (Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s						
2) Notice 3) Informa	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F No(s)/Mail Date <u>09202004, 01082004</u> .	Pap)-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/753,840 Page 2

Art Unit: 1623

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue". These factors include, but are not limited to:

- 1. the breadth of the claims;
- 2. the nature of the invention;
- 3. the state of the prior art;
- 4. the level of one of ordinary skill in the art;
- 5. the level of predictability in the art;
- 6. the amount of direction provided by the inventor;
- 7. the existence of working examples; and

8. the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

Claims 1-10 are drawn to a method of treating a viral infection mediated by a virus of family *Flaviviridae* other than by Hepatitis C Virus by administering to an animal in need thereof a therapeutically effective amount of a compound according to formula I. Claims 2 and 4-5 further limit viral infection. Claim 5 also limits the dosage regimen. Claim 3 further limits the compound of formula I. Claim 6 limits the animal. Claim 7-10 further require the co-administration of an immune system modulator. Claims 8-10 further limit the immune system modulator. Claim 11 is drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising a compound of formula I for treating a viral infection mediated by a virus of family *Flaviviridae* other than by Hepatitis C Virus in an animal

Undue experimentation is required to determine which compounds of formula I are effective for treating a viral infection in an animal mediated by a virus of family Flaviviridae other than by Hepatitis C Virus. It is noted that while a treatment and dosage regimen is presented in the specification, it is not seen as sufficient to support the invention of the claims. The instant specification is not seen to provide adequate guidance which would allow the skilled artisan to extrapolate from the disclosure and examples provided to enable the use a compound of formula I for the treatment of a viral infection in an animal mediated by a virus of family Flaviviridae other than by Hepatitis C Virus. No working examples are provided. No data is presented in support of applicant's claim of treatment of animals having a viral infection with a compound of formula I. No in vitro data is presented suggesting viral activity of the instant

Application/Control Number: 10/753,840

Art Unit: 1623

compounds. There is no suggestion of the use of art-recognized animal models by applicant in the specification. It is noted that Law requires that the disclosure of an application shall inform those skilled in the art how to use applicant's alleged discovery, not how to find out how to use it for themselves.

There are no teachings in the prior art which would lead one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to predict that the administration of a compound of formula I would effectively treat a virus of family *Flaviviridae*. Leyssen et al. Clinical Microbiology Reviews, Jan. 2000, Vol. 13, pages 67-82 (Leyssen) is representative of the state of the art at the time of the invention. Leyssen teaches that *Flaviviridae* are enveloped, positive single-stranded RNA viruses. This virus family contains three genera: *Hepacivirus*, *Flavivirus* and *Pestivirus*. Viruses belonging to different genera have different biological properties and do not show serological cross-reactivity. Leyssen further teaches on page 76, Prospects for Treatment, "Despite the major clinical impact of flaviviruses such as DENV, JEV, and TBEV, there is as yet no drug available for the chemoprophylaxis or chemotherapy of infections with these viruses." Regarding pestiviruses, Leyssen teaches, "Therapy for pestivirus infections is not believed to be an option."

A disclosure in an application, to be complete, must contain such description and details as to enable any person skilled in the art or science to which it pertains to make and use the invention as of its filing date, In re Glass, 181 USPQ 31; 492 F2.d 1228 (CCPA 1974). A broad claim requires a correlatively broad and sufficient disclosure to

Art Unit: 1623

support it. Examples and description should be of sufficient scope as to justify the

scope of the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Devos et al. US 6,784,166 (Devos). Devos teaches compounds of formula I and their use as antiviral drugs for the treatment of HCV infections in humans (Abstract; column 3, lines 12-17). Compositions comprising compounds 13 and 27 anticipate the instant claim (columns 9 and 15). Although Devos only discloses the compounds as suitable for the treatment of HCV, a preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Application/Control Number: 10/753,840

Art Unit: 1623

Conclusion

Page 6

Claims 1-11 are pending. Claims 1-11 are rejected. No claims are allowed. 5.

Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Patrick T. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-

0655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10 am to 3 pm (Maxi

Flex).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit 1623

ptl